

VZCZCXYZ0000  
OO RUEHWEB

DE RUEHGV #0990/01 3101456  
ZNY SSSSS ZZH  
O 061456Z NOV 09  
FM USMISSION GENEVA  
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 0068  
RUEAIIA/CIA WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RUEKDIA/DIA WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RUEKJCS/CJCS WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RUEKJCS/VCJCS WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RUEKJCS/JOINT STAFF WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RHEHNSC/NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RUEHNO/USMISSION USNATO IMMEDIATE 5331  
RHMFISS/DEPT OF ENERGY WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RHMFISS/DTRA ALEX WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RUESDT/DTRA-OSSES DARMSTADT GE IMMEDIATE  
RUENAAA/CNO WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RHMFISS/DIRSSP WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
INFO RUEHTA/AMEMBASSY ASTANA PRIORITY 2508  
RUEHKV/AMEMBASSY KYIV PRIORITY 1517  
RUEHMO/AMEMBASSY MOSCOW PRIORITY 6704

S E C R E T GENEVA 000990

SIPDIS

DEPT FOR T, VC AND EUR/PRA  
DOE FOR NNSA/NA-24  
CIA FOR WINPAC  
JCS FOR J5/DDGSA  
SECDEF FOR OSD(P)/STRATCAP  
NAVY FOR CNO-N5JA AND DIRSSP  
AIRFORCE FOR HQ USAF/ASX AND ASXP  
DTRA FOR OP-OS OP-OSA AND DIRECTOR  
NSC FOR LOOK  
DIA FOR LEA

E.O. 12958: DECL: 11/06/2019

TAGS: [KACT](#) [MARR](#) [PARM](#) [PREL](#) [RS](#) [US](#) [START](#)

SUBJECT: START FOLLOW-ON NEGOTIATIONS, GENEVA (SFO-GVA-VI):  
(U) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WORKING GROUP MEETING,  
OCTOBER 30, 2009

REF: GENEVA 0989 (SFO-GVA-VI-040)

Classified By: A/S Rose E. Gottemoeller, United States  
START Negotiator. Reasons: 1.4(b) and (d).

¶1. (U) This is SFO-GVA-VI-046.

¶2. (U) Meeting Date: October 30, 2009  
Time: 4:00 - 5:00 P.M.  
Place: U.S. Mission, Geneva

-----  
SUMMARY  
-----

¶3. (S) On October 30, 2009, the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Working Group (WG) met at the U.S. Mission for the third meeting this session (seventh meeting overall) to continue a line-by-line review of the U.S.-proposed Joint Draft Text (JDT) of the MOU Annexes, provided at a previous MOU WG meeting on October 29, 2009 (REFTEL). The sides confirmed that disagreements still existed in Annexes A, B, C and D. The sides did agree that Annex J could continue being worked in the MOU WG but that it would be moved to the third tier of the Inspection Protocol document.

¶4. (U) Subject Summary: Russia to Respond to U.S.-Proposed Package Deal; MOU Annex A; MOU Annex B; MOU Annex C, MOU Annex D; MOU Annex J; and, The Value of the Ad Hoc Group.

-----  
RUSSIA TO RESPOND TO

U.S.-PROPOSED PACKAGE DEAL

-----

15. (S) Mr. Trout opened the meeting and welcomed the Russian Delegation. He stated that, based on previous discussions, the MOU Annexes would be placed in the third tier of the treaty documents.

16. (S) General Orlov interrupted Trout's remarks to inform the WG that the Russian WG members would depart the meeting early to attend a meeting at the Russian Mission to discuss the U.S. package deal proposal provided to Russia in Moscow on October 28, 2009. He said the Russian side would respond to the package deal soon.

-----

MOU ANNEX A

-----

17. (S) Trout confirmed that Annex A (ICBM and SLBM Technical Data) of the U.S.-proposed JDT would still retain Russian brackets around the categories of "Greatest Throw Weight," "Launch Weight," "Length Used for Confirming a New Type," "Weight of Fully Loaded Stage," all categories associated with "Fixed Structures for Mobile Launchers of ICBMs," and the footnote on data for new types of ICBMs and SLBMs. Orlov stated that the Russian side would study the bracketed text and respond later.

-----

MOU ANNEX B

-----

18. (S) Reviewing Annex B (Heavy Bomber Technical Data), Trout noted that the WG had not yet agreed on whether to use the U.S.-proposed phrase "Nuclear Armaments" or the Russian-proposed phrase "Long-Range Nuclear ALCMs." Trout said the U.S. side would agree to drop the brackets in the columns to Annex B around "Variant of a Type." The column would read "Bomber type and variant of a type."

19. (S) Col Pischulov asked why the U.S. side did not want to provide distinguishing features for the U.S. section "Heavy Bombers Equipped for Nuclear Armaments." Mr. Rust replied that the United States only intended to declare distinguishing features when it was necessary to differentiate between variants or categories of bombers of the same type. He said that in the case when there was only a single category for a type of heavy bomber, there was no need for this information. He noted that this provision was a carryover from START where there was a requirement for this information.

110. (S) Orlov referred the WG to the column entitled "Bomber Type and Variant of a Type." He noted that there were different types and listed the B-52G, B-52H, and technical data for pylon assemblies. Rust asked the Russian side for their reason for including the long list of technical data in the MOU and in what verification provisions they envisioned using it. Orlov only stated that the title of the section was heavy bomber technical data and therefore required technical data in it, adding that, though the Russian side was not asking for excessive data, the U.S. side should consider including this data. LT Lobner asked whether the Russian side was proposing a possible name change to the Annex. Orlov shrugged and said that his team will study the issue. Trout concurred and said that the U.S. side would study this issue as well. Trout added that the U.S. side was willing to provide distinguishing features for heavy bombers under the section "Heavy Bombers Equipped for Non-Nuclear Armaments."

-----

MOU ANNEX C

-----

¶11. (S) Trout moved on to Annex C (Heavy Bomber Nuclear ((Armaments))1 ((Long-Range ALCMs))2 Technical Data). He noted that the brackets in the title of the Annex remained because of the Russian side's insistence that heavy bomber categories be split into "Heavy Bombers Equipped for LRNA" and "Heavy Bombers Equipped for Nuclear Armaments Other Than LRNA." Trout asked the Russian side whether it intended to deploy different types of LRNA. Orlov responded that the Russian side did not know since the treaty would cover a 10-year period.

¶12. (S) Trout closed the discussion on Annex C and noted that the sides had differing views on the title of the section for nuclear missiles with ranges less than 600 KM. He said that the sides needed to decide whether nuclear air-to-surface missiles should be called ALCMs or not, and that each side should think on this issue.

-----  
MOU ANNEX D  
-----

¶13. (S) Moving to Annex D (Other Data Required by the Treaty), Trout queried the Russian side whether it had changed its position about monitored facilities or on mobile launchers of ICBMs. Orlov smiled and said that the first four paragraphs of this Annex will remain bracketed as U.S. positions only.

¶14. (S) Regarding the category of "Other Aircraft," a U.S.-only phrase, Orlov proposed that the name be changed to "Inspection Aircraft." However, Col Novikov opined that the sides could use Open Skies aircraft to transport START Follow-on inspection teams to entry points and that the Inspection Protocol Working Group could study this concept. Since there was some continued debate regarding what aircraft would be used in the treaty, and how they would be used, both sides agreed to leave the term bracketed until further details could be confirmed.

¶15. (S) Under the category of Inspection Sites, Trout asked the Russian side to remove the category of "Flight Test Centers" because these centers were not inspectable and should not be listed under the inspection site category. Orlov agreed it did not belong there, but the category needed to be listed elsewhere. He stated the Russian side would look into this further.

-----  
MOU ANNEX J  
-----

¶16. (S) Annex J (Other Requirements) was the last item on the agenda. Both sides agreed that this data should be moved into the third tier. Trout informed the Russian side that he had an agreement with Dr. Warner that the MOUWG would continue to handle Annex J, but the annex would move to the third tier under the Inspection Protocol. Orlov concurred.

-----  
THE VALUE OF  
THE AD HOC GROUP  
-----

¶17. (S) Trout noted that there were major issues remaining that needed to be addressed. He suggested that an Ad Hoc Group could address possible solutions to these issues, especially the larger counting rules issues. Orlov said that he proposed to his head of delegation the same idea and had made the recommendation that both sides should decide on the topic far enough ahead of the Ad Hoc Group meeting to have the time to prepare for substantive discussions.

¶18. (U) Documents exchanged. None.

¶19. (U) Participants:

U.S.

Mr. Trout  
Lt Col Blevins

Mr. Buttrick  
Mr. Colby  
Mr. Coussa  
Mr. DeNinno  
Dr. Dreicer  
LT Lobner  
Mr. McConnell  
Mr. Rust  
Dr. Tarrasch  
Mr. Vogel  
Dr. Hopkins (Int)

RUSSIA

Gen Orlov  
Mr. Leontiev  
Col Novikov  
Mr. Pischulov  
Col Voloskov  
Ms. Zharkih  
Mr. Gayduk (Int)

120. (U) Ries sends.  
GRIFFITHS